

## REMARKS

Reconsideration of the rejection of the claims is respectfully requested. The claims call for making the determination within the sink of whether or not to receive power from a power supply. The cited Oprescu reference works in exactly the opposite way.

It is apparently suggested in the office action, firstly, that the claims do not require the sink to determine whether to obtain power from the source. To the contrary, claim 1, as amended, calls for using the power class identifier in the sink to determine in the sink whether to receive power from the source.


The same language is provided in claim 11.

Claim 21 is to the same effect requiring a processor-based device to analyze power class information received from the source and automatically determine whether to receive power from said power source. Thus, the limitations are clear and explicit.

There is also the suggestion within the remarks that the Applicant's disclosure supports a sink that may determine whether the source is valid to charge his battery, but, inexplicably, it is contended that "there is no support for a source that provide power class information to a sink for the purpose of allowing the sink to decide whether to obtain power from the source." The significance of this statement is not clear. There is no objection to the claims under Section 112. There is no such source that is ever claimed. Thus, it is not clear what the import of that statement might be.

In any case, reconsideration is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,



---

Timothy N. Trop, Reg. No. 28,994  
TROP, PRUNER & HU, P.C.  
8554 Katy Freeway, Ste. 100  
Houston, TX 77024  
713/468-8880 [Phone]  
713/468-8883 [Fax]

Date: November 15, 2005

Attorneys for Intel Corporation